

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,483	12/13/2001	Atsushi Okada	216823USOXPCT	1812
22850	7590 06/15/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			TRAN LIEN, THUY	
	RIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

72	Application No.	Applicant(s) (
Advisory Action	10/009,483	OKADA ET AL.	_
,	Examiner	Art Unit	<u> </u>
	Lien T Tran	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addres	s
THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	old abandonment of this applicated abandonment which	ation. A proper reply to	a
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amonths shortened statutory period for replace	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See R 1.136(a) and the appropria unt of the fee. The appropria	e MPEP ate extension ate extension
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C. 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's	e later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	ing date of the final rejection .	, even if
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	t 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	riod set forth in the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be			
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or simpli	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would to canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims wor	s) a) $oxtime$ will not be entered or b) $[$ uld be rejected is provided below	☐ will be entered and a v or appended.	an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_		
B.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appro		•	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>	
0. Other:		LIEN TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER Chaup 1707	
		-	

Application No. 110/009,483

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitations of " in the absence of added liquid" and " free of added liquid" were not claimed previously. This raises new issue. Also, the amendment raises new 112 issue.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument is not persuasive for reason of record. The argument directed at the new claims is not persuasive because the amendment was not entered. Additionally, the wet crumb referred to in Bernacchi et al is crumb which has not been dried because Bernacchi et al disclosed " the dispersion may be applied to wet crumb and then the crumb and coating dried". This crumb is equivalent to the fresh bread crumb claimed because the specification discloses the crumb has not been dried. The difference is in the terminology used..